



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/745,435 | 12/26/2000 | Hiroyuki Sekitani | 001499 | 1560 |

7590 10/23/2003

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
McLELAND & NAUGHTON
1725 K. Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2175

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,435

Applicant(s)

SEKITANI, HIROYUKI

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 14-August-2003 has been entered.

Remarks

2. In response to communications filed on 25-June-2003, claim 1 is amended per applicant's request. Claims 1-3 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2175

4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashihara et al (U.S. patent No. 6,571,147) in view of Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 6,202,070), and further in view of McCain et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,482.)

As to claim 1, Kashihara et al teaches an information management system for manufacturing machines (see Abstract) comprising:

a database (see figure 13) that manages input and output in addition to memory of individual machine information (see column 11, line 53 through column 12, line 7), which is a body of information concerning each machine (see column 16, line 66 through column 17, line 3);

an information processing means (see column 17, lines 10-20); and

an access means that is installed in each of the information processing means which is capable of performing addition and updating of the individual machine information (see column 17, lines 41-43, and see column 19, lines 22-62), wherein each manufacturing machine is a punch press, a lathe, a laser cutting machine or a machining center used in the industrial manufacturing facility for production (see column 1, lines 12-23, where “a punch press, a lathe, a laser cutting machine or a machining center used in the industrial manufacturing facility for production” is read on “a variety of apparatuses (manufacturing apparatuses, (e.g., automatic lathes, milling machines, NC machine tools, printing machines, post-printing machines, various plate making equipment, various semiconductor fabricating apparatuses), robots, transport equipment, and the like) for use in various industries (printing and plate making, machine, electric, chemical and metal industries and the like”).)

Kashihara et al does not teach:

Art Unit: 2175

information processing for each of the company departments; and each manufacturing machine as products of a company, the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement, installation and production, as well as wishes of customers obtained before designing in addition to maintenance information.

Nguyen et al teaches a computer manufacturing system architecture with enhanced software distribution functions (see Abstract), in which he teaches:

information processing for each of the company departments (see column 11, lines 6-15, where “cross-departmental coordination” is taught, and see column 13, lines 38-51); and

each manufacturing machine as products of a company (see column 24, lines 51-62, where “building of machines to the specification of individual customers” indicate that each machine is a product of the company”); the individual machine information including parts books (see column 47, lines 4-21, where “parts books” is read on “listing of all the part numbers”), drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement, installation and production (see column 8, lines 51-67), as well as wishes of customers obtained before designing in addition to maintenance information (see column 24, lines 51-58.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kashihara et al to include information processing for each of the company departments; and each manufacturing machine as products of a company; the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement, installation and production, as well as wishes of customers obtained before designing in addition to maintenance information.

Art Unit: 2175

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kashihara et al by the teachings of Nguyen et al, because information processing for each of the company departments would enable the system to obtain feedback and coordinate the process with the various organizations within the company; and each manufacturing machine as products of a company; the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement, installation and production, as well as wishes of customers obtained before designing in addition to maintenance information, would enable the system to provide the users with all the necessary information they would need to install, update and utilize the desired components on their production machine.

Kashihara et al as modified, still does not teach maintenance information obtained after the start of the operation of the manufacturing machine in an industrial manufacturing facility.

McCain et al teaches a communications, information, maintenance diagnostic and training system (see Abstract), in which he teaches maintenance information obtained (see column 1, lines 40-48) after the start of the operation of the manufacturing machine (see column 9, lines 59-62, where “after the start of operation” is read on “continuously monitor the operation of machines and system on the factory floor”) in an industrial manufacturing facility (see column 4, lines 17-20.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kashihara et al as modified to include

Art Unit: 2175

maintenance information obtained after the start of the operation of the manufacturing machine in an industrial manufacturing facility.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kashihara et al as modified, with the teaching of McCain et al, because including maintenance information obtained after the start of the operation of the manufacturing machine in an industrial manufacturing facility, would enable the system to obtain detailed post-installation maintenance data from manufacturing machines, in order to diagnose and expedite appropriate updates and repairs.

As to claim 2, Kashihara et al as modified teaches wherein the database is connected to the information processing means (see Kashihara et al, column 11, line 65 through column 12, line 20) of the departments and the customers via a network (see Kashihara et al, column 2, line 60 through column 3), information processing means of the customers having an access means that is capable of performing addition and updating the individual machine information of the database (see Kashihara et al, column 17, lines 41-43, and see column 19, lines 22-62.)

As to claim 3, Kashihara et al as modified teaches wherein the company departments include a sales department, a technical department, a procurement department, a production department, and a maintenance service department (see Nguyen et al, column 11, lines 6-13, where “distribution” and “cross-departmental coordination” are taught. It is inherent that larger companies consist of various departments including Sales, Technical, Procurement,

Art Unit: 2175

Production, and Maintenance Service departments”), with the database having an access limiting function that limits addition and updating of information in the individual machine information depending on the departments and the customers (see Nguyen et al, column 9, lines 19-25.)

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 25-June-2003 with respect to claims 1-3 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection:


Conclusion

6. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

October 10, 2003


DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100